

Appl. No. : 09/912,646
Filed : July 24, 2001

REMARKS

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1-18. Claims 10 and 18 have been amended, and no new matter has been added. Thus, Claims 1-18 are presented for further examination. Reconsideration and allowance of all Claims 1-18 in light of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Objections to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to "because of numerous problems with lettering and line quality, and because of dark areas in Figs. 17 and 18 that lead to illegibility." Replacement drawing sheets 1-18 are attached which replace previously filed drawings sheets 1-18. Applicant respectfully submits that the replacement drawing sheets are in compliance with USPTO requirements, and therefore requests the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Discussion of Objections to the Specification

The abstract of the disclosure was "objected to because it is too short." The Examiner also stated that the "title of the invention is not descriptive" and that a "new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed." A replacement abstract with additional description of the disclosure is attached, and the title has been amended to "SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR DISPLAY OF MULTIPLE ELECTRONIC PAGES". Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

Discussion of Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 18 as filed recited "method of Claim 1" and has been amended to recite "method of Claim 10". With this amendment, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Discussion of Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 4-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,239,797 to Hills, et al.

In regard to Claim 1, the Examiner stated that “Hills teaches a system (abstract) for providing a distributed software application (col. 1, line 5 – col. 2, line 20), comprising:

- a. A server (Fig. 1, #24) comprising a stored electronic main page (Fig. 1, #20), wherein the main page comprises at least two browser components (Fig. 2, #40) for displaying additional electronic pages within the main page (Fig. 3, #122);
- b. A client computer (Fig. 1, #32) comprising a browser program (Fig. 1, #38) configured to establish a communication link with the server (col. 2, lines 58 – col. 3, line 20) and display the stored electronic main page (col. 3, lines 35-60); and
- c. At least one software control on the main page (Fig. 2, #50 and #52) for selecting one of the at least two browser components to display in the browser program (col. 3, lines 35-60).”

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053.

Applicant respectfully submits that Hill fails to describe a main page comprising “at least two browser components for *displaying* additional electronic pages within the main page”, and “at least one software control on the main page for selecting one of the at least two browser components to *display* in the browser program” as recited in Claim 1.

Hills describes a method for database scroll/update without refresh, wherein a browser 38 has three frames: a display frame 40, an update frame 48, and a scroll frame 44. *Hills at col. 3, lines 28-33*. The display frame 40 is the only frame visible to a user wherein, although the scroll frame 44 and update frame 48 are associated with the display frame 40, they are hidden from the user. *Col. 3, lines 36-39; col. 4, lines 28-31*. When a user desires to scroll through data on an associated database, the user selects an appropriate arrow 50 with their mouse and the scroll frame 44 retrieves data from the associated database. *Col. 3, lines 39-42*. The retrieved scroll data is then populated into the appropriate places of the display frame without refreshing the entire screen. *Col. 3, lines 44-48; col. 4, lines 37-53*.

Thus, Hills fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, at least two browser components for displaying additional electronic pages within a main page as recited in Claim 1. In contrast to the system of Claim 1, the scroll frame and update frame described by Hills are hidden from the user, and they cannot be selected for display in the browser.

Appl. No. : 09/912,646
Filed : July 24, 2001

Therefore, as Hills fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, every element as recited in Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

As Claim 10 recites limitations similar to those recited in Claim 1, the arguments with respect to Claim 1 similarly apply to Claim 10, and thus, Claim 10 is respectfully submitted for further review as patentable subject matter.

Because Claims 2, 4-9, 11, and 13-18 depend from Claims 1 and 10, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 4, they incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which they refer. It is therefore submitted that these claims are in condition for allowance at least for the reasons expressed with respect to the independent claim, and for their other features.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 3 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,239,797 to Hills, et al. as applied to Claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of the MSHTML API Overview.

Because Claims 3 and 12 depend from Claims 1 and 10, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 4, they incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which they refer. It is therefore submitted that these claims are in condition for allowance at least for the reasons expressed with respect to the independent claim, and for their other features.

Conclusion

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, amendments to the claims for purposes pursuant to statutory section 112, the reasons therefore, and arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. In light of these amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. : 09/912,646
Filed : July 24, 2001

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: May 17, 2005

By: Tiffany Miller
Tiffany Miller
Registration No. 52,032
Agent of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

1305295_1
030305

Appl. No. : **09/912,646**
Filed : **July 24, 2001**

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Replacement drawing sheets 1-18 are attached which replace previously filed drawings sheets 1-18. The replacement drawing sheets contain formalized versions of Figures 1-18.